

REMARKS

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of May 6, 2003.

The specification has been amended to include headings and an Abstract of the Disclosure.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by the Haugerud reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,712,184) in view of the Chainani reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,074).

The Haugerud reference discloses a microcomputer connected to a robotic toy. It appears that the only example of the microprocessor given in the Haugerud reference is the "Commodore 64 computer" which is a unit of a size comparable to the size of the robotic toy. The microcomputer in the Haugerud reference is connected to the robotic toy by a cable, which limits the robotic toy in its range of motion in relation to the immobile microcomputer.

It appears from the Office Action that the microcomputer and the robotic toy of the Haugerud reference is considered as one unit, being a toy building element equivalent of the toy building element of the presently pending claims.

Moreover, the present patent application relates to a toy building element including a microprocessor and display and being apt to be coupled to other building elements such as motors, wheels, collision detectors and light detectors (see page 2, lines 1-2) so as to form a single movable toy, which is immediately programmable by activating icons on the display integrated in the toy building element, and where a pattern of movement can be represented by signalling with the icons. By use of signalling with the icons, the movable toy can show or display which programming it is performing while it is performing it. This is neither shown nor suggested in either the Haugerud or the Chainani reference.

Signalling with the icons is an advantage in that the users of the movable toy are given feedback on which movement patterns are being executed. Therefore, a user can better understand the consequences of performing a movement pattern and better follow the execution of the program.

In the prior art, programmable toy elements with maneuvering means may have an unintended crash when moving beyond the edge of a table, because a child playing with the toy might not be capable of remembering all of the steps of the program and the physical consequences of the programmed movements. When the toy element comprises a plurality of icons that are configured to illustrate movement patterns and when the icons can be activated by a user for programming, and when the icons can be signalled to represent a movement pattern followed by the toy building element, a user can readily see which movements caused by a program are being executed. This, in turn, can help the user to remember the individual steps of the program since the toy was programmed with the same icons. Consequently, the user may interrupt the movement patterns if, unintended by the user, the program is about to cause the toy element to crash.

For all of the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to

withdraw the rejections of the claims, to allow the claims, and to pass this application to early issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald Levy  
Registration No. 24,419

Ronald E. Brown  
Registration No. 32,200

Pitney, Hardin, Kipp & Szuch, LLP  
685 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
212-297-5800